

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

SILVER STATE BROADCASTING, LLC; a Nevada LLC; ROYCE INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION; a Nevada corporation; GOLDEN STATE BROADCASTING LLC, a Nevada corporation.  
Plaintiffs

Case No. 2:11-cv-01789-APG-CWH

**Order Rejecting Joint Pretrial Order**

(Dkt. #259)

v.

BEASLEY FM ACQUISITION CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; BEASLEY BROADCASTING OF NEVADA, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company; WAEC LICENSE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; a Delaware limited partnership; KJUL LICENSE LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company; MICHAEL JAY BERGNER dba BERGNER & CO., an individual; DOES 1 through 50; and ROE ENTITIES 51 through 100, inclusive.

Defendant.

18 The parties' proposed Joint Pretrial Order (Dkt. #259) does not comply with Local Rule  
19 16-4. For example, in section VII(c), the "parties reserve all objections to exhibits at this time."  
20 (Dkt. #259 at 11.) The Local Rule requires the parties to specify their objections, not reserve  
21 them for later. Similarly, in their list of exhibits, "Counter-Claimants reserve the right to  
22 supplement their list of exhibits with any of the documents identified in the list attached as  
23 Exhibit 'A.'" Counter-defendant attempts to do the same thing, identifying "Any exhibits  
24 identified in Plaintiff/Counterdefendants (sic) initial disclosures or supplements thereto." Parties  
25 are required to disclose their trial exhibits and cannot "reserve their rights" or refer vaguely to  
26 "any exhibits." Further, Counter-defendant designates entire deposition transcripts, rather than  
27 specific page and line designations. Such vague, broad designations of exhibits and deposition

1 transcripts make it impossible for the other party to object. The proposed Order is replete with  
2 additional inadequacies; I do not care to waste my time cataloguing those for the parties.

3 Local Rule 16-3 requires the parties to personally discuss these and other issues. The  
4 requirements in Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 are designed to make the parties meaningfully discuss  
5 the upcoming trial, so that the trial preparation and presentation can be streamlined and to foster  
6 settlement. It is apparent from the proposed Joint Pretrial Order that the parties either ignored  
7 Local Rule 16-3, or did not properly conduct the required conference in the spirit of the rule.  
8 Accordingly,

9 IT IS ORDERED that the parties' Joint Pretrial Order (**Dkt. #259**) is **REJECTED**. The  
10 parties shall personally confer as required in Local Rule 16-3, and submit a Joint Pretrial Order  
11 that complies with Local Rule 16-4 within 21 days of entry of this Order.

12 Dated: this 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016.



---

13 ANDREW P. GORDON  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28